

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 5

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

March 15, 1980

NSF Assailed for Shortchanging Education

The annual Congressional authorization hearings for the National Science Foundation have been fairly humdrum this year, with the main exception being some peppery testimony against poor-relation treatment that NSF traditionally gives to its science-education functions.

Though NSF always bestows many good words on virtually anything to do with science — from kindergarten science games to deep-sea drilling — the historical fact of the matter is that NSF is the bank for serious academic science, and the powers that be at that now-billion-dollar bureaucracy are only marginally concerned with other than serious academic science. That doesn't mean that the NSF chiefs don't see considerable value in all sorts of other science-related activities. It's just that, given the imbalance between limited amounts of money and the usual over-

Foreign-Aid R&D Institute Blasted in Congress---Page 8

abundance of claims on it, NSF has opted for putting its wealth into what might be called core scientific activities. To the extent that it puts money elsewhere, it is in response to grudgingly accepted Congressional directives, guilt feelings about far out, but possibly worthy, projects, and, in some measure, for hush-up purposes. Which, then, helps account for the fact that out of a proposed fiscal 1981 budget of \$1.148 billion, the Science Education category has been allotted \$85.7 million. Since, even with adjustments for the transfer of a few of NSF's education activities to the new Department of Education, this is an increase of only \$7.5 million over current NSF education budgeting, the net effect is a slip down the inflationary slope.

In terms of what NSF has in the past spent on science education, as can be seen in the table on page 2, the 1981 amount borders on the trivial, both in plain dollars, which have gone down sharply, and in the inflationary erosion of the cut-back appropriations.

NSF, of course, has a bit of a point in its favor when it contends that science education is an activity shared in by many other organizations — local school authorities, state-supported institutions, and other federal agencies — while frontier basic research in universities has few places, apart from NSF, to turn to for support.

Finding cover in this plurality of support, NSF has tacitly concluded that the bulk of its money should go into basic research grants and support for big research centers — which, as was protestingly pointed out at a hearing last month, represents a skewed interpretation of NSF's basic

legislative charter. In a statement to the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, James L. Powell, Vice President and Provost of Oberlin College, noted that "The NSF mandate states clearly that it is 'to initiate and support . . . programs to strengthen scientific research potential and science education programs at all levels. Thus,' Powell continued, 'the Foundation must give due attention both to the novel and innovative and to the sustenance of the on-going process of science education. Neither is favored over the other in the mandate.'"

Nonetheless, Powell stated, NSF's basic research and education budgets — \$172 million and \$141 million, respectively, in 1967 — "have now diverged to the point where the budget for science education is less than one-tenth that for basic research."

Powell said that NSF has sought to attribute the shift to declining enrollments, but, he pointed out, "college enrollments did not fall over that decade, they are just now peaking, and will head into the well-publicized decline in the next year or two. The decline in funding for science education has preceded the decline in college enrollments by nearly a decade, and there must be another explanation for it: that the Foundation and the Office of Management and Budget simply have chosen to emphasize support for basic research over that for science education. The same emphasis continues with the 1981 budget: the total agency

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

The failure of the Soviet Academy of Sciences to go ahead with its expected ouster of Academician Andrei Sakharov at its early March meeting is interpreted by some Soviet science watchers in Washington as signs of: (1) the retention of some strong measure of autonomy by the Academy, and (2) a response to the barrage of warnings and exchange cutoffs on the part of American scientific organizations and leaders.

Finally resolved by the Supreme Court: the nagging question of whether papers produced by non-government recipients of federal research funds are subject to the Freedom of Information Act. No, said the Court, in a 7-2 ruling against a group of physicians who sought raw data from an NIH-supported study of treatment for diabetes.

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents in a new Harris poll said that scientific research will be a major source of national strength in the next 25 years.

...Science Teaching Gets Budgetary Crumbs

(Continued from Page 1)

request is up by 15.5 per cent, but that for Science Education is only increased by 9.6 per cent. The Science Education budget is only 7.45 per cent of the total NSF budget."

Powell suggested a number of expansions and innovations in NSF's science-education activities, and accompanied them with an extremely sensible suggestion for obtaining some additional funds — though actually a relatively small amount in the overall picture — to finance his ideas:

"Still further funding could be made available if, as we have suggested before, the size of the National Science Board were decreased somewhat from its present 24 members. If there are sound arguments for retaining the Board at such a size and at the significant cost of \$475,000 plus support staff salaries, we suggest that the Subcommittee hear those arguments."

Another witness at the hearing was one of the founders of the postwar science-education movement, Jerrold R. Zacharias, emeritus professor of physics at MIT. Zacharias, who feels that the educational innovations developed by him and his colleagues were thwarted by inadequate

support and bureaucratic incompetence, had very few good words for the management of NSF.

"In 1956," he said, "we believed that we could pull the United States up to par [in world standards of science education] and by 1966, we had made substantial inroads into the problem . . . By 1968, the Science Board of the NSF rubbed its hands, said the job was done, and proceeded to spread whatever money was available in dribs and drabs to every part of the country. Several hundred professional scientists had become involved [in curriculum-development programs], but as soon as the funding was cut off, they crawled back into the cool comfort of their laboratories."

"Now any farmer knows not to pull up the seedlings to look at the roots, nor to desiccate and impoverish the healthy plants as they are beginning to grow. Just so, NSF should have paid attention to what they had done and what remained to be done. The jobs that remain to be done are 10 to 100 times larger than what had gone on in the first 10 years."

And then, Zacharias took off after what is clearly the enemy of the day for many of those dissatisfied with NSF

(Continued on Page 3)

SUPPORT OF SCIENCE EDUCATION & BASIC RESEARCH¹ NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FY 1967-1981 in FY '67 Dollars (In Millions of Dollars)

Fiscal Year	NSF Budget Expenditure for Science Education	Amount Needed to Equal FY 67 Expenditures for Science Ed.	Purchasing Power of NSF Sci. Ed. Support in '67 Dollars	NSF Budget Expenditure for Basic Research	Amount Needed to Equal FY 67 Expenditures for Basic Research	Purchasing Power of NSF Basic Research Support in '67 Dollars
'67	141.7	141.7	141.7	172.6	172.6	172.6
'68	147.6	145.9	143.3	170.6	177.8	165.6
'69	117.4	153.0	108.7	176.0	186.4	162.9
'70	107.0	161.5	93.8	161.0	196.7	141.2
'71	88.2	170.0	73.5	180.3	207.1	150.3
'72	74.0	177.1	59.2	248.6	215.8	198.9
'73	39.9	145.7	30.4	268.0	226.1	204.6
'74	58.1	201.2	40.9	281.0	245.1	197.9
'75	54.7	222.5	34.8	338.1	271.0	215.4
'76	44.3	238.1	26.4	520.9	290.0	310.1
TQ ²	2.4	59.5	1.4	128.1	72.5	76.3
	46.7	297.6	27.8	649.0	362.5	386.3
'77	56.3	253.6	31.4	472.9	309.0	264.2
'78	59.1	276.3	30.3	601.9	336.6	308.7
'79	63.1	310.3	28.8	635.5	378.8	290.2
'80	61.2	347.2	25.0	679.4	422.9	277.3
'81	66.3	379.8	24.7	791.4	462.6	295.3

¹Science Education does not include Graduate Student Support or Traineeships, Technological Innovation in Education and Public Understanding of Science. Basic Research includes Mathematical & Physical Sciences; Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth & Ocean Sciences; Biological, Behavioral & Social Sciences; Engineering, and the following programs consolidated in "Cross-Directorate Programs," which were previously funded through one or more of the named directorates: Industry/University Cooperative Research, University Research Facilities Improvement, 2-Year/4-Year College Instrumentation, Regional Instrumentation Facilities and Research Initiation in Minority Institutions. (This is done to maintain compatible figures.)

²TQ — Transition Quarter, reflecting new budget cycle.

Prepared by the Independent Colleges Office, a 16-member association of institutions affiliated with the Great Lakes Colleges Association.

New Chief Chosen for Institute of Medicine

Frederick C. Robbins, Dean of Case Western Reserve School of Medicine, has accepted the presidency of the Institute of Medicine — the health-policy research subsidiary of the National Academy of Sciences. Robbins, 63, who is a Nobel laureate in medicine, succeeds David A. Hamburg, a psychiatrist, formerly of Stanford University, who's going to head a newly established health-studies division at Harvard.

Robbins has been active in the IOM from its earliest days, having headed studies on abortion and saccharin and food safety — which have been among the thorniest and emotion-arousing issues taken on by the generally

drowsy institution. Robbins was recently appointed Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. Since that's a parttime position, he may possibly retain it while holding the IOM presidency, which is fulltime.

Robbins shared the 1954 Nobel Prize with John Enders and Thomas H. Wellers for developing virus cultivation techniques that are widely employed in vaccine production.

He's planning to start work at the IOM in August, and will be formally inaugurated at the organization's annual October meeting.

NSF (Continued from Page 2)

— the National Science Board, the presidentially appointed, parttime, so-called policy-making body of the Foundation.

"The last point I wish to bring before you," said Zacharias, "is that the Education Directorate is struggling against an almost impossible enemy — an enemy from within. From its inception, the Science Board that supervises NSF has treated the Education Directorate as a trivial country cousin. They have said that the government should

give the NSF money for scientific research and never mind what happens to the 200 hundred million people who don't do research. It is those very people whose lives, jobs, leisure, entertainment, food, security, and everything else depend on a sound economy in a democratic society. The federal government can no longer allow itself to neglect the schools, and the NSF has in its charter the responsibility and authority to do something about them."

All true and worthy of attention. But with the Carter Administration dedicated to budget balancing and increasing scientific research, this is a poor time to be arguing for NSF to expand its spending on science education. — DSG

Some of NSF's Ed Programs

(in millions)

Comprehensive Assistance to Undergraduate Science Education

\$13.0

Encourages broad scope improvement in quality and effectiveness of undergraduate science education. Maximum \$250,000 award for up to three years in response to detailed plans for a coordinated set of activities for science departments, groups of departments or institution's total science education effort.

Instructional Scientific Equipment Program

3.0

Encourages improvement in undergraduate science education by matching support for purchase of new scientific equipment for educational purposes.

Local Course Improvement

3.5

Funds concentrated, short-term, small-scale efforts by individuals or small groups of faculty to upgrade undergraduate science instruction by redesigning courses in the sciences and social sciences.

Student Science Training

3.0

Provides talented high school students with special advanced courses and/or research participation experience beyond that available in high school for students with high potential from high schools with deficient science training or students with high ability from nationally-recognized, excellent high schools.

Pre-College Teacher Development in Science

7.2

(Teacher Training Programs) Funds academic year or summer programs of continuing education for elementary and secondary school teachers in mathematics, natural or social sciences to upgrade the quality of science teaching.

Undergraduate Research Participation

3.0

Provides talented undergraduate students with firsthand experience in scientific research activities through direct collaboration with science faculty.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg
Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Susan Burke

European Correspondents

Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguer (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$89.50 (two years, \$168.50); individuals, \$48.50 (two years, \$82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Education Department Off to a Slow Start

Getting organized and into business is proving to be a slow process for the newly established Department of Education (ED).

Though five months have passed since Mr. Carter signed the law creating the Department, and its first Secretary, US Circuit Court Judge Shirley Hufstедler, was appointed in January, many of its top jobs remain vacant, while others are only now being filled.

Earlier this month, the White House named Steven Minter, former Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Welfare and currently Vice-President of the Cleveland Foundation, as Undersecretary of Education, Hufstедler's deputy. At the same time President Carter pleased the higher-education associations by announcing that he would nominate Albert Bowker, who will shortly retire as Chancellor of The University of California, Berkeley, as Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education. And the Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement will be James Rutherford, the National Science Foundation's Assistant Director for Science Education. In addition, Betsy Levin, a Duke University law professor, has been appointed General Counsel — a key post in a big new department with a new legislative charter.

Four other senior officials — three assistant secretaries and the Inspector-General — still have to be chosen. Dick Beattie, director of the ED transition team, expects to recommend candidates to the White House very soon. He

sees early May as the likely starting date for the Department, which takes in the federal education activities of Health, Education and Welfare, together with a handful of small programs from other agencies. Congress gave the Administration until the end of May to get the show on the road.

In January Mrs. Hufstедler predicted that the department would come into operation in April. But Beattie (former General Counsel at HEW) says the transition is proving more difficult than he expected, because of the "nuts and bolts problems" — finding office space, setting up administrative and managerial systems, getting the payroll organized, and so on. "We're getting them resolved," he said, adding that he expected that ED would start life running relatively smoothly.

One major organizational uncertainty surrounding ED has been the position of research, and in particular of the National Institute of Education, the leading federal supporter of educational research, with an annual budget of close to \$100 million. Beattie said that NIE will remain in existence as a self-contained institute with its own director. (NIE staff would be pleased if Michael Timpane, who has been Acting Director since Patricia Graham resigned last summer, were given the job.) It will be part of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, under Assistant Secretary James Rutherford, along with the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Educa-

(Continued on Page 5)

In Quotes: A Bleak View of Canadian R&D

The following is from an address, "Technology, the Ultimate Resource," by Walter F. Light, President of Northern Telecom Limited, Canada's biggest R&D-supporting industrial firm:

... Canada spends less on industrial research and development than any major industrialized country. While our major competitors are spending from 2 per cent to 2.5 per cent of their gross national product on R&D, Canada is limping along on 0.9 per cent of GNP. This shows up in our society and economy in a number of ways.

For instance, of the nearly quarter-of-a-million patents granted in Canada over the past 10 years, less than 6 per cent, or about one in 18, was granted to a Canadian. Almost 80 per cent of all technology employed in Canada is imported.

While in the US, Japan, West Germany, and Sweden, for every one scientist or engineer engaged in R&D in government there are five in industry, in Canada, the ratio is one to one. Without a doubt, this is the prime reason we have an over-supply of highly trained research

manpower in Canada . . . One multinational company, IBM, the largest manufacturer of semi-conductors in the world, spends more on R&D in any year than does all of Canada. . .

While the United States, largely as a legacy of the space and defense programs of the last two decades, is the current leader in [semiconductors and software], other countries — Japan, the United Kingdom, France, West Germany — are challenging. Each is investing hundreds of millions of dollars in state subsidization of semiconductor development being carried out by private companies in what is, in essence, a form of state verticle integration. Others have called it semiconductor nationalism.

These massive government-supported R&D programs are bearing fruit. The Japanese, for example, are now moving strongly into the US semiconductor market, and hold an estimated 26-plus per cent of the world market. A recent Bank of America study suggested the Japanese will capture one-third of the world semiconductor market by 1985 . . . Where does this leave Canada? Still out in the rain, unfortunately. And the rain is getting heavier. . .

... Budget Cuts May Lie Ahead for Department

(Continued from Page 4)

tion, the National Center for Educational Statistics, and many other programs.

Rutherford said it was too soon to ask him in detail for his plans. In general he sees his role as "providing the Department with its view to the future." Although Rutherford believes research is "the key" to improving education, he emphasized that his office would give priority to research directed specifically at educational improvement and not to basic undirected educational research.

As Rutherford's entire professional life has been devoted to science education, he naturally hopes ED will become more involved in this area. It is rather ironic than, as an NSF official, he fought hard to hold on to the Foundation's education programs. The campaign was successful and Congress eventually voted to transfer only two small education programs — pre-college teacher development in science and minority institutions science improvement — to ED, while the NSF kept 90 per cent of its education activities.

Meanwhile, the White House is preparing to announce a series of government-wide budget cuts, in response to growing concern about federally fueled inflation, so there is no point in going into detail here about the \$15.5 billion ED budget for 1981, which Hufstедler proudly unveiled in January. According to the rumors, the department is in line for a \$900 million cut.

Such a reduction would be "devastating" for the fledgling Department, said Charles Saunders, governmental relations director for the American Council on Education. "I think everybody is going to be very upset. It is going to make it very difficult for the new officials in the Department to hold their heads up in the educational community if their first job is to cut back on services."

Fortunately ED has a public affairs chief capable of presenting the axe in the best possible light if it does fall — Liz Carpenter, former Press Secretary to Ladybird Johnson. She was the first Assistant Secretary to be nominated, and the best known.

In addition to probable budget cuts, ED will have to come to terms with a required reduction in manpower. To allay fears that the new Department would mean an increase in the federal bureaucracy, the legislation creating ED mandated the elimination of 500 of its 17,000 positions by the end of September 1981. That's standard fare around the federal establishment, even out of election season — but more so in it, of course. There are, however, innumerable devices, such as contracting out for services once provided by federal employees, that really add up to no reduction in manpower; often, in fact, they add up to an increase.

As things now stand, the new Department should be off and running just as the primary season hits its peak and

NAS Issues Nutrition Guide

The National Academy of Sciences is out with its latest edition (the ninth since 1943) of *Recommended Dietary Allowances*, described, deadpan, by the venerable institution as "the classic reference tool for nutrition, dietary, and allied health professionals."

The publication, prepared by the Academy's Food and Nutrition Board under contract to the National Institutes of Health, contains a pretty good distillation of research-based conclusions about human nutrition requirements. Each edition is supposed to represent an updating of research findings; the latest, for example, has a good deal of new information on trace elements. And, it is largely from *Recommended Dietary Allowances* that the Food and Drug Administration draws up the Recommended Daily Allowances (RDAs) that appear on food package labels and TV ads.

The main flaw in this exercise is that the interest in dietary allowances goes back to a wartime period — when the main concern was adequacy of diet for the population. Since then, the main thrust of enlightened nutritional concerns has been directed toward the dietary excesses of the population, such as fats, salt, sugar and alcohol. Though some citizens do suffer from inadequacies, and the dietary-allowance concept is useful for food planning in the mass, the allowance concept is widely considered to be both obsolete and confusing. The producers of the report regularly explain that "allowances" are not the same as "requirements." But it's doubtful that the general public has a clear idea of what's the difference — even when the Academy's findings are transmuted by the FDA into Recommended Daily Allowances.

Copies of *Recommended Dietary Allowances*, 186 pages, are available for \$6 each from: National Academy of Sciences, Office of Publications, 2101 Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.)

Washington begins to focus its attention on the political conventions and the presidential campaign. Thus, it can count on receiving relatively little public attention — barring some cataclysmic event in the normally staid field of education. That's not too bad a situation for a bureaucratic newcomer on the Washington scene.

However, if Mr. Carter is not returning to office, ED will have to start all over again with the personnel process which it is now enroute to completing. —Clive Cookson

(The author is Washington correspondent of the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, London.)

Britain: At Last, a Plea for Soviet Dissidents

London. The abuse of dissident scientists in the Soviet Union has at last produced a high-level public protest in the British scientific community, which has previously confined itself to claims of behind-the-scenes remonstrations on behalf of Soviet colleagues. The shift to outspoken protest involves none other than the President of the Royal Society, Lord Todd, and his platform was the recent Scientific Forum of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in Hamburg.

Over the years we have come to expect public statements on behalf of dissidents from the leaders of the US scientific establishment, but Lord Todd and the pillars of Britain's scientific community have remained silent on individual cases. Todd has always maintained that he can achieve more in personal contacts with the leaders of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. This approach, whose effectiveness cannot be verified, has brought Todd and the Royal Society into conflict with British scientists who have campaigned on behalf of mistreated researchers in the USSR.

Todd explained his position in 1976 in a Royal Society anniversary meeting. His case then was that a lot of people have their rights infringed in the Soviet Union — there is nothing special about scientists. And since it is the job of organizations like the United Nations to campaign on human rights, "... it is hard to see in what way the Royal Society can occupy a special position in the matter of human rights in general".

"In appropriate cases," Todd went on, "the Society has drawn and will continue to draw the attention of the Soviet Academy of Sciences or the corresponding body in any other country concerned, as well as our own government, to the facts and to the need for action with, I believe, good effect. It is my firm belief that the Society as such can achieve much more in this way than it can by subscribing to or issuing public declarations."

The recent treatment of Andrei Sakharov has clearly altered Lord Todd's view because his Hamburg speech — at a meeting held as a follow-up to the Helsinki agreement on human rights — directly criticized the Soviet authorities' recent action.

"The harsh and inhuman treatment meted out by the Soviet authorities to some of their scientists for what, even if established by fair and open trial would be regarded by all of us in the West as comparatively minor indications of disagreement with authority, is rapidly destroying the possibility of real cooperation in science," Todd warned. "Does the Soviet government realize the extent and depth of resentment which its action toward men like Sakharov, Orlov, Scharansky and many others has aroused, particularly among young scientists throughout the world? Even at this late stage I would call on our Soviet colleagues to impress again upon their government the damage which such actions are doing to science in the Soviet Union and

the urgent need for change in its behavior; without such change I see — greatly to my regret — little future for true cooperation between us."

The extent of Todd's discontent with the USSR was made clearer in a letter to all Fellows of the Royal Society. This letter said that the Royal Society will not go along with a Soviet request to expand the formal agreement under which Britain and the USSR exchange scientists. However, Todd's letter went on to say that the Royal Society is not contemplating any reduction in the exchange agreement with the Soviet Academy of Sciences because "it would not be in the best interest of science or scientists, including many colleagues in the USSR, if we called for a substantial reduction or cancellation of this exchange agreement. However, in the last resort it will be the conscience of the individual which will determine the future success or failure of the program."

Todd's letter hinted at some of the reasons for the Royal Society's discontent. Under the agreement, each country can send its scientists to the other for a total of some 200 "person weeks" a year. Todd's letter speaks of a "lack of balance and reciprocity in the operation of the exchange program."

Though the agreement specifies that the country sending the scientist to the other has the final decision on who is to go, something like a half of the British scientists who go to the USSR are either personally invited, or approached informally, by the Soviet authorities. On the other hand, when the Royal Society tries to nominate whom it wants to come to Britain from the USSR it is rarely successful. Indeed, an official of the Royal Society told SGR that of 25 Soviet scientists nominated by the Society, only one had actually turned up in Britain. Two others accepted invitations, but they have yet to be seen.

This failure to bring to Britain the desired scientists has been especially frustrating to conference organizers. As Todd said in his speech: "Organizers of scientific meetings and seminars as well as individual university departments have all too frequently invited individual Soviet scientists to visit Britain, often with generous expenses included, only to find that their invitation is ignored, rejected or accepted and then cancelled at the last moment without any explanation and with, on occasion, serious consequences for the organizers of the meetings concerned. So

(Continued on Page 7)

Correction: Israeli R&D Report

Israel's National Council for Research and Development advises that we erred (SGR Vol. X, No. 1) when we stated that its newly issued report "Scientific Research in Israel 1979" is available without charge. The price is \$10, including surface mail postage "until the end of March."

...Another Look at UK-USSR Science Pact

(Continued from Page 6)

little information is obtainable in most cases that it is hard to say how much of the difficulty we encounter is due to sheer bureaucratic ineptitude and how much to political pressure."

Todd's letter to Fellows said: "We shall adhere to the exchange program so long as it can operate to equal and mutual advantage and to the benefit of science. This will depend to a large extent on decisions by individual Fellows and other scientists concerned. If an invitation is received to visit the USSR, for example, or a Soviet scientist requests a visit to a laboratory in the United Kingdom, the Society and the individuals concerned should ask themselves if the resulting contacts are likely to be of mutual advantage or unacceptably one-sided."

The sudden change of approach by the head of the Royal Society came as a surprise to some members of Britain's scientific community. One of the most surprised was Professor John Charap of London University. He told SGR that he was "bowled over" by Todd's speech because just 10 days before the Hamburg meeting started, Charap had been a part of a delegation that had visited Todd in the House of Lords. The delegation wanted Todd's support in a number of cases. Charap told SGR that he had gathered

the impression that Todd, who led the British delegation to the Hamburg meeting, wasn't even interested in making private representations on the dissidents' behalf, let alone public statements.

If anything, Todd was more outspoken on the Sakharov affair than other scientists in Britain. Apart from a telegram from the Institute of Physics — and an ambiguously worded one at that — and the inevitable letter to *The Times*, there has been little expression of discontent. The Royal Society, on the other hand, sent a telex to Moscow on the day after Sakharov's "arrest and exile" asking for an explanation from the Soviet Academy of Sciences. No reply has been received so far. — MK

OTA Names Congressional Liaison

Marvin Ott has been appointed head of the Office of Congressional and Institutional Relations of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. Ott, who has been with OTA since 1976, will be responsible in his new post for coordinating relations between OTA and the Congressional committees that it serves, as well as with Executive Branch agencies and non-governmental research organizations.

Science & Government Report International Almanac—1978-79

Nature calls it: "...an essential source of reference for scientific administrators, politicians and students. . ."

New Scientist says: "...well-informed and . . . certainly well written."

368 pages, hardbound, containing 22 original review articles on science-policy developments in all the major industrialized nations and the major developing nations. Plus, the official texts of important science-policy documents, including the historic speeches at the People's Republic of China National Science Conference, and President Carter's Message to Congress on Science Policy.

Published at \$54 per copy—NOW AVAILABLE TO SGR readers for the reduced price of \$29.50. (A full refund of purchase price will be made if for any reason the volume is returned in good condition.)

To place your order, please fill out the coupon and send to:

SGR International Almanac
PO Box 6226
Washington, DC 20015

Please send _____ copies of SGR International Almanac—1978-79 at the reduced price of \$29.50 per copy.

☐ check enclosed

☐ please bill

Name _____

Address _____ Zip _____

New Aid Institute Takes Beating on "Hill"

A Congressional goon squad led by Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.) has ravaged a long-planned foreign-aid research institute to the point where it's uncertain whether it's dead or alive.

The object of long Congressional wrangling over items ranging from its name to its budget and its authority to have its own emblem (SGR Vol. X, No. 3), the Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation — as it was finally named — exists to the extent that Congress last year passed an authorizing act proclaiming its existence. And the US delegation to last summer's UN Conference on Science and Technology for Development made the then-gestating agency the centerpiece of its offerings for assistance to the world's poor and research-hungry nations.

DeConcini, however, never relented in his opposition to the organization. He regularly claimed that he was opposed because this is a poor time to be expanding any federal program, especially foreign aid — a position that finds many friends and few opponents in the nation's presentday mood about taxes and spending. What he left out, however, was that the institute would mainly orchestrate and pull together a lot of farflung research activities; the total amount of money wouldn't be much different.

The Senator got his chance for another shot at the institute when the issue switched from authorization to budget. With the House willing to fund the institute, DeConcini successfully led a Senate move to block any appropriations. When conferees from the two chambers met to seek a compromise, the anti forces finally agreed to

an appropriation of \$12 million — the Administration originally wanted \$25 million plus the transfer of some \$65 million from existing foreign-aid research programs.

The conference stipulated, however, that the \$12 million is to be given to the institute's parent organization, the International Development Cooperation Agency, successor to the Agency for International Development; also, that there is to be no transfer — at least in the present fiscal year — of existing AID research monies to the institute.

Further complicating this already highly tangled situation is that total Congressional appropriations have burst through the ceiling that Congress set for itself under its new budgeting system, and something will have to give.

Though the conference report on the foreign-aid bill says that the institute is a "distinct entity," there's considerable uncertainty as to whether it has anything more than a paper existence. Planning for the institute was severely crimped last fall when DeConcini charged that the skeleton crew that had been assembled to put the institute together was stirring up support from academics who were very likely in line to share the institute's largesse. Though that's nothing new on the Washington scene, the Senator — who has an eye for publicity-getting ploys, as demonstrated by his exploitation of the Panama Canal Treaty deliberations — succeeded in clipping the institute's wings. Since then, the staff has confined itself to such mundane matters as preparing Congressional testimony and responding to public inquiries. Under the gun, it has forsaken the critical matter of drumming up support.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.
